REMARKS

I.   Status of the Application

Claims 22, 23, 34 and 43-55 are pending in this application. In the June 8, 2010 office action (hereinafter "Final Office Action"), the Examiner:

A.   Rejected claims 22, 23, 34 and 43-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0143872 to Weiss et al. (hereinafter "Weiss") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,689 to Markle (hereinafter "Markle").

In this response, respectfully traverse the rejections of the pending claims. Reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

II.   Obviousness Rejection of Claim 22

Claim 22 stands rejected as allegedly being rendered obvious over Weiss and Markle. As will be discussed below in detail, the proposed modification of Weiss does not arrive the invention of amended claim 22. For example, neither Weiss nor Markle, either alone or in combination teach or suggest a feature "wherein said communicated service related information is organized by site, and includes information identifying a *quantity* of service calls having an open status, and information regarding a *quantity* of service calls having a closed status."

A.   Claim 22

Claim 22 is directed to a method of providing information relating to service activity for a plurality of building sites that includes a step of providing a web portal comprising a database. The method involves storing service related information about a plurality of building sites in the database, the web portable capable of being operatively connected to one or more clients. The method also includes storing service activity information for a plurality of service calls, storing for each of the plurality of calls a corresponding status of the service calls. The method further includes receiving at the web portal a request for information about a status of service activity for one or more building sites from one or more clients. As claimed, the method also includes determining at the customer web portal a plurality of service activities that are implicated by the request, and communicating from the web portal information implicated by the request such that the information is capable of being on a client display.

The communicated service related information is organized by site. As per the amendments presented herein, the communicated service related information includes information identifying a quantity of service calls having an open status, and information regarding a quantity of service calls having a closed status.

Thus, as amended, the method not only communicates service related information, but also communicates information regarding the *number* of service calls having an open status and the *number* of service calls having a closed status. For example, as shown in Fig. 10, element 408 of the client display shows quantities of open and closed service calls. Such information has been communicated to the client display.

B.   Weiss Does Not Disclose Communicating
       Service Related Information Including Information
       Identifying Quantities of Open and Closed Service Calls

Weiss fails to disclose or suggest "communicating from said web portal information
… identifying a quantity of service calls having an open status, and information regarding a
quantity of service calls having a closed status", as recited in claim 22. While Weiss does
imply that service call status for individual status calls can have open or closed status,
quantity information relating to service calls is not tracked or communicated.

Specifically, Weiss mentions that the system 10 "…monitors performance and
completion of any required physical provisioning based upon the Work Order data 8C".
(Weiss at para. 0050). The monitoring of "completion of any required physical provisioning"
arguably implies determining when a service call changes from open status to closed status.
However, Weiss does not teach or suggest communication of information regarding a *quantity*
of service calls having open status and a *quantity* of service calls having closed status. In
other words, Weiss does not teach or suggest the ability to determine and communicate how
many service calls are open, and how many service calls are closed. Weiss simply does not
contemplate this feature, as it is unrelated to the goals of Weiss.

In the rejection of claim 22, the Final Office Action states that communication of the
quantity of open and closed service calls is taught in paragraphs 48, 50 and 52 of Weiss.
(Final Office Action at p.3). These paragraphs do *not* teach this feature, and will be addressed
individually.

Paragraph 48 of Weiss reads as follows:

[0048] A Notification System 12 may also be used. The Notification System 12 is used to notify
users and personnel of changes made through the control module 2. In the preferred embodiment,
the Notification System 12 is an email server.

Nothing in the above quoted paragraph mentions anything about communicating anything related to service calls. Instead, the above paragraph discusses a generic notification system.

Paragraph 50 of Weiss is similarly deficient, and reads as follows:

[0050] In step 34, the control module 2 then triggers a work process, through interaction with Work Management System 10, to initiate the physical work relating to the provisioning of Services 4, 4A, 4B affected by the Quote data 8A. The control module 2 determines whether physical work must take place and, if so, it creates Work Order data 8C in a database shared with the Work Management System 10. In step 36, the Work Management System 10 directs the assignment of appropriate personnel and monitors performance and completion of any required physical provisioning based upon the Work Order data 8C. In step 38, the control module 2 interacts with the Work Management System 10 to confirm completion of the provisioning required by the Work Order data 6A. In step 40, the Work Management System 10 confirms whether required work has been completed.

Nothing in the above quoted paragraph mentions anything about determining or communicating a *quantity* of service calls, much less quantities of service calls having open and closed status. While, the above paragraph discusses that the status of an *individual* service call may be monitored, and may even be changed, the above paragraph does not discuss or contemplate obtaining and communicating information identifying *quantities* of service   calls.

Paragraph 52 of Weiss also fails to teach the subject limitation of claim 22, and reads as follows:

[0052] In step 46, the control module 2 generates billing information for use by Business Management System 10. To this end, the control module 2 creates Billing data 8B in a database shared with Business Management System 10. Finally, the control module 2 interacts with the Notification System 12 to generate messages to be sent to all people affected by the provisioning changes. Thus, in step 48 messages are sent to users who are provided with information concerning the new services that have been provisioned. In addition, messages will be sent to internal service provider personnel to notify them of the provisioning changes. In the preferred embodiment, the Notification System 12 is an electronic mail server.

Nothing in the above quoted paragraph mentions anything about determining or communicating a *quantity* of service calls, much less quantities of service calls having open and closed status. The above paragraph discusses that "messages" can be sent to users with

5

information about new services they have been provided. It does not mention anything about identifying a *quantity* of service calls, and certainly nothing about service calls having an "open status".

Thus, the Final Office Action has not identified any teaching in Weiss of "communicating from said web portal information … identifying a quantity of service calls having an open status, and information regarding a quantity of service calls having a closed status", as recited in claim 22. Weiss fails to teach the generation of such information, and consequently fails to teach the communication of such information. Instead, Weiss merely teaches the communication of general information via e-mail.

C.   Markle Does Not Teach Communicating Service-Related Quantity Data

Similarly, Markle fails to disclose or suggest "communicating from said web portal information … identifying a quantity of service calls having an open status, and information regarding a quantity of service calls having a closed status", as recited in claim 22. It is noted that the Final Office Action also does not allege that Markle teaches or suggests anything related to open and closed service call information. (Final Office Action at pp.3-4).

D.   The Combination of Weiss and Markle Fail to Arrive at Invention

As a consequence, neither Weiss nor Markle, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest "communicating from said web portal information … identifying a quantity of service calls having an open status, and information regarding a quantity of service calls having a closed status", as recited in claim 22. Therefore, the proposed combination of Weiss and Markle does not arrive at the invention of claim 22. For at least this reason, the obviousness

rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.

III.   New Claims 43-49

New claims 43-49 depend from claim 22 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

IV.   Claims 34 and 50-53 are Allowable

Claim 34 includes limitations similar to that of claim 22, discussed above.   In particular, claim 34 recites:

> web portal capable of communicating said service activity information implicated by said request such that said service activity information is capable of being displayed on a client display, said communicated service activity information including information capable of being displayed to *identify a quantity of service calls having an open status, and a quantity of service calls having a closed status.*

As discussed above, neither Weiss nor Markle teaches or suggests communicating information regarding the number of service calls having open and closed status. Accordingly, neither reference communicates information *capable of being displayed* to identify the quantity of service calls having open and closed status. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claim 34 is in error and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 50-53 depend from claim 34 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

V.   Claims 23 and 54-55 are Allowable

Claim 23 recites the following limitation:

> wherein said communicated service related information is organized by system, and includes information identifying a quantity of service calls for each of a plurality of systems.

As discussed above, Weiss does not teach or suggest communicating any information identifying *quantities* of service *calls*. Markle certainly does not, and is not alleged to teach, the communication of such information. While Weiss teaches the monitoring of service orders, it does not teach communicating information identifying a *quantity* of such service calls for a plurality of systems, as per claim 23.

Accordingly, for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 22, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 54-55 depend from claim 23 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

VI.   Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

    /Thomas J. Burton/
Thomas J. Burton
Registration No. 47,464
Attorney for the Applicant

Siemens Industry Inc.
1000Deerfield Parkway
Buffalo Grove, IL 60089
Tel.: 847-941-6823
Fax: 847-941-6810